



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/066,560	02/06/2002	Susumu Kato	219201US0	2615

22850 7590 10/01/2002

OBLON SPIVAK MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT PC
FOURTH FLOOR
1755 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

CLARDY, S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1616

DATE MAILED: 10/01/2002

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
10/066,560

Applicant(s)
Susumu et al

Examiner
S. Mark Clardy

Art Unit
1616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 6, 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1616

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application.

Applicants' claims are drawn to solid agrochemical compositions comprising a fragment of a fiber crop (e.g., kenaf, claim 4) and a liquid or dissolved/dispersed agrochemically active agent (claims 1-8), methods of making them (claims 9-10), and a method of applying the compositions (claim 11). Claims 12 and 13 are drawn to compositions comprising the fiber crop fragments.

Claims 5-8 and 11 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75© as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim may not depend from another multiply dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merit

Claims 1-4, 9, 10, 12, and 13 have been examined further below.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(f) he did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented.

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) because the applicant did not invent the claimed subject matter. These claims are simply drawn to plant material such as kenaf fiber which applicant clearly did not invent. It is immaterial what the functional characteristics of the material are.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having

Art Unit: 1616

ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 9, 10, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Hansen et al (US 5,589,256) and Sugiyama et al (US 6,372,333).

Hansen et al teach natural fibers such as kenaf (col 7, lines 33-37) which are useful carrier substrates for various active agents including pesticidal/herbicidal materials (Table I). Polymeric materials such as polyacrylates may be combined with the fiber carriers (columns 9-10).

Sugiyama et al teach compositions comprising various core materials such as pulp, cotton, hemp, and kenaf (col 2, lines 49-51; col 7, lines 15-20; col 8, lines 60-61) which form a porous core onto which are bonded macromolecular materials such as polyvinyl alcohol (col 1, lines 45-66). The compositions may further comprise materials such as insecticides (col 12, lines 1-2).

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine these references because they disclose conventional formulations of solid pesticidal materials using a core, a binding material, and an active agent.

Thus it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined applicants' materials in a single granular composition because it was known in the art to use a binder material to adhere pesticidally active agents onto a solid substrate such as pumice, kenaf, or wood byproducts.

No unobvious or unexpected results are noted; no claim is allowed.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the

Art Unit: 1616

contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103c and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Mark Clardy whose telephone number is (703) 308-4550.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "S. Mark Clardy", is positioned above the printed name and title.

S. Mark Clardy
Primary Examiner
AU 1616

September 30, 2002